| Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) |
|--|-------------------|----------------|
| | 10/813,697 | DODELET ET AL. |
| | Examiner | Art Unit |
| | David Turocy | 1762 |
| All Participants: Status of Application: | | |
| (1) <u>David Turocy</u> . | (3) | |
| (2) <u>George Seaby</u> . | (4) | |
| Date of Interview: 9 February 2007 | Time: <u>3 pm</u> | • |
| Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative) Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description: | | |
| Part I. | | |
| Rejection(s) discussed: | | |
| Claims discussed: Claim 18 and claim 22 Prior art documents discussed: | | |
| Part II. SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED: See Continuation Sheet | | |
| Part III. | | |
| ☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. ☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above. | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| • | | |
| · | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| (Examiner/SPE Signature) (Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate) | | |

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The applicant agreed claim 18 should more reasonable depend from claim 22, and therefore agreed to an examiners amendment to remedy the issue and place the case in condition for allowance. Additionally, the applicant agreed to claim amendments to claim 22 to remedy antecedent issues.